

REMARKS

The August 23, 2006 Office Action rejected claims 11-16. The Office was not persuaded by Applicant's response dated October 23, 2006 (which contained no claim amendments). The Advisory Action dated November 20, 2006 provided comments regarding why the Office would not allow original claims 11-16. This Response, which is being filed concurrently with an RCE, amends claim 11 and presents new independent claims 24 and 25 for consideration. After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 11-16, 24, and 25 (8 total claims; 3 independent claims) remain pending. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the amendment to claim 11 and the following remarks.

Claims 11-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kakizawa, USPN 6,580,556 ("Kakizawa"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. For the sake of brevity, Applicant incorporates herein any relevant remarks set forth in the response dated October 23, 2006.

Briefly, Applicant reiterates that the "frame violations" recited in independent claim 11 are not akin to the processing of "frames" as taught by Kakizawa. For the sake of added clarity, claim 11 has been amended as recommended by the Examiner to specify that "the stereoscopic image appears at a viewing surface" and to distinguish the recited frame violation effects from the type of "frame" issues addressed by Kakizawa. In particular, claim 11 has been amended to recite that the obscuring step prevents "frame violation effects in the stereoscopic image, such that objects appearing in front of the viewing surface are not blocked by an edge of a display frame." No new matter has been presented by this amendment, and Applicant's original specification contains support for this amendment, as discussed at length in Applicant's previous response.

As mentioned in Applicant's remarks from the previous response, Kakizawa does not teach all of the limitations of independent claim 11. Therefore, Kakizawa does not anticipate claim 11 and Applicant requests the withdrawal of the §102 rejection of claim 11. For at least the same reasons, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the §102 rejection of claims 12-16, which variously depend from claim 11.

New Claims

New claim 24 is similar to amended claim 11. In claim 24, however, the obscuring step prevents "blocking of a displayed object in the stereoscopic image that appears in front of the

viewing surface by another displayed object in the stereoscopic image that appears behind the displayed object.” This limitation relates to a particular definition of “frame violations” as set forth in Applicant’s specification. Indeed, no new matter has been presented by this amendment, and Applicant’s original specification contains support for this amendment, as discussed at length in Applicant’s previous response.

New claim 25 is also similar to amended claim 11. Claim 25, however, recites that “the stereoscopic image appears at a viewing surface and within a viewing window having a perimeter” and that the obscuring step prevents “frame violations in the stereoscopic image.” Moreover, claim 25 specifies that “frame violations occur when objects intended for display behind the viewing surface are displayed in a manner that makes the objects appear in front of the viewing surface.” This clause provides a particular definition of “frame violation” as set forth in Applicant’s specification. Indeed, no new matter has been presented by this amendment, and Applicant’s original specification contains support for this amendment, as discussed at length in Applicant’s previous response.

Therefore, new claims 24 and 25 are also allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above for claim 11.

In conclusion, for the reasons given above, all claims now presently in the application are believed allowable and such allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to further discuss this application, Applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at (480) 385-5060.

If for some reason Applicants have not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent abandonment on this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: December 22, 2006

By: /MARK M. TAKAHASHI/
Mark M. Takahashi
Reg. No. 38,631
(480) 385-5060